REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended, and claims 20 and 21 have been newly addded. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection based on Clapp

1.   Claims 1-4, 13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Clapp (U.S. Patent No. 5,893,914). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites an electronic document information expansion apparatus for expanding information on an electronic document. The apparatus includes an input section, an information analysis section, an internal data acquisition section, an information addition section, and a structured data generation section. The input section is for inputting the electronic document. The information analysis section is for extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document. The external data acquisition section is for acquiring external data that can be added to the electronic document based on the extracted location information. The information addition section is for generating addition data to be added to the electronic document using the acquired external data. The structured data generation section is for combining the addition data generated by the information addition section with the electronic document, and generating structured data with the information on the electronic document expanded.

Amended claim 13 recites an electronic document information expansion method for expanding information on an electronic document. The method includes an information analysis step of extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, the extracted location information indicating a location of an information

8

source external to the input electronic document; an external data acquisition step of acquiring external data that can be added to the electronic document based on the extracted location information; an information addition step of generating addition data to be added to the electronic document using the acquired external data; and a structured data generation step of combining the addition data generated in the information addition step with the electronic document, and generating structured data with the information on the electronic document expanded.

One characteristic of the present invention is associated with the phrase "location information" recited in claims 1 and 13. As described, for example, on page 7, lines 4-10 of the application, the information analysis section 101 divides the e-mail document into information units each having one article, and then extracts a URL included in each information unit. The phrase "location information" refers to location information indicating the location of external data that are not included in the target electronic document, such as the link to or the location of an external information source, e.g., the URL. The external data can thus be obtained based upon the location information.

According to the present invention, the location of an information source for external data not included in the electronic document can be ascertained by extracting the location information present in the electronic document so as to enable utilization of the information in the external information source as well. In other words, the location information extracted does not relate to data present in the document. More particularly, the phrase "location information" recited in the claims refers to information with regard to an external information source and does not indicate the location of data contained in the electronic document.

In contrast, Clapp does not teach "location information." Clapp describes an interactive computerized document assembly system and method where a document is created from a template and does not disclose any processing comparable to that executed according to the present invention. The Office relies on steps 206, 222 and 226 of Fig. 20, flow chart 260 in

Fig. 21, and col. 9, lines 58-60, where Clapp describes "[g]etting the start and end locations of a template block for satisfying the recited information analysis section."

Applicants respectfully submit that Clapp nowhere describes or reasonably suggests an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document**." Clapp therefore fails to anticipate claim 1 or claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. The application of Clapp by the Office fails to meet this criteria, and claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Clapp.

Claims 2-4, 18 and 19 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-4, 13, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Clapp.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp and Schilit

2. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Schilit (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,922 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Schilit describes a method and system for suggesting related documents. Schilit fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Schilit fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document**."

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Schilit.

10

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp and Bence

3.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Bence (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,178 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 depends from claim 4 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Bence describes a system and method for providing and updating user supplied context for a negotiations system. Bence fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Bence fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document.**"

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Bence.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp and Kanno

4.   Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Kanno (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,683 B2). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 depends from claim 4 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Kanno describes an apparatus for retrieving similar documents and an apparatus for extracting relevant key words. Kanno fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Kanno fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the**

11

extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document."

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Kanno.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp and Nonomura

5.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Nonomura (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143742 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Nonumura describes an apparatus, method, and program for retrieving structured documents. Nonomura fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Nonomura fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document."**

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Nonomura.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp, Nonomura and Al-Kazily

6.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Nonomura and Al-Kazily (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,694 B2). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

12

Claim 11 depends from claim 9 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Al-Kazily describes an automatic information collection system using most frequent uncommon words or phrases. Al-Kazily fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Al-Kazily fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document.**"

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Nonomura and Al-Kazily.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp and Maeda

7.   Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Maeda (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,458 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 12 and 17 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Maeda describes a scheme for constructing a database for a user system from structured documents using tags. Maeda fails to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Maeda fails to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document.**"

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Maeda.

13

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection based on Clapp, Bence and Howard

8.   Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Bence and Howard (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,622 B1).   Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Further, Bence describes a system and method for providing and updating user supplied context for a negotiations system, and Howard describes a system and method for providing and updating user supplied context for a negotiations system. Bence and Howard fail to supplement the deficiencies of Clapp because Bence and Howard fail to teach or reasonably suggest an "information analysis section extracting location information on data included in an input electronic document from the electronic document, **the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document**."

Claims 15 and 16 depends from claim 14 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Bence and Howard.

New Claims

9.   Newly added dependent claims 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, specify that the extracted location information indicates a location of an information source external to the input electronic document is URL information, and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\747716\1

Conclusion

10. All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge the fee of $50.00 for an additional claim in excess of twenty to Deposit Account No. 22-0261. No additional fees are believed to be required. However, if the Patent Office deems that any fees are necessary, authorization is hereby granted to charge any required fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

May 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.
    Registration No.: 41,289
Thomas C. Schoeffler
    Registration No.: 43,385
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

MAS/TCS

15

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\747716\1